

member of the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union, and he was serving as President of Local 4-367 when elected in 1972 as a member of the Texas House of Representatives, a position in which he served for 8 terms. In the Texas Legislature, Ed was a leader on issues of law enforcement, education, environmental protection, and creating economic opportunity, and he served several terms as Chairman of the Harris County Delegation. Currently he is a Community Liaison on my congressional staff in Pasadena and Deer Park, Texas.

Ed is a charter member of the Deer Park Chamber of Commerce and a charter member of the Lions Club. He served fourteen years as a volunteer fireman and is now one of six honorary members. He has been actively involved in the Wheel House, a 30-day alcohol rehabilitation facility, since 1954 and serves on their board of directors. Ed visits daily, reaching out to the residents, solving problems when they arise, and funding.

Ed also serves on the board of directors of the Interfaith Helping Hands Ministry. He also volunteers his time at First Baptist Church, serving on the Benevolence Committee and reaching out to people not only in the church, but in the community as well. Because of his caring ways, Ed was named Deer Park Citizen of the Year in 1987.

Jerry's achievements are also impressive. In 1961 Jerry went to work for the Registrar of San Jacinto College. In 1963 the College began teaching about computer science, and Jerry began taking classes and working on the college information system. During some semesters, she was taking a class, working, and teaching a key-punching class after work. During this time, she and three of her children were all enrolled in college. Jerry received her Certificate Technology Degree in Computer Science the same night her younger son received his A.A. Degree in Computer Science. She retired from San Jacinto College in 1982.

Jerry was one of the earliest members of the Deer Park Ladies Civic Club and assisted in preparing the first Deep Park telephone book to be published. With Ed, Jerry also works with the Interfaith Helping Hands Ministry and she has served on the Bereavement Committee at First Baptist Church many times.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Ed and Jerry Watson on the occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary and commend them on a lifetime of achievement. Their commitment not only to one another, but to others as well, is an example for all of us. May the coming years bring good health, happiness, and time to enjoy their eight grandsons, one granddaughter, and one great grandson. On this joyous occasion, I am pleased to join their family, friends, and community in saying congratulations and thank you.

**"OVERTURN THE ROYALTY
GIVEAWAY AMENDMENT"**

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1998

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last week, legislative larceny was committed in the conference committee on the Emergency Supplemental. As happens too often in this Con-

gress, the hold up was committed by wealthy interests who want to make themselves still richer with money that belongs to the taxpayers of this country.

Senator BARBARA BOXER put up a valiant fight to prevent the committee from accepting the oil companies' \$66 million royalty giveaway amendment, but the industry had the conference wired. The oil industry, which has been cheating taxpayers for years, won.

Today, we are introducing legislation to reverse that legislative maneuver and restore the money to the people who own the oil: the taxpayers of the United States.

I wrote the provision of the offshore oil law in 1978 that requires that coastal states receive a share from the oil produced from federal lands adjacent to their coasts. But the oil companies have been cheating taxpayers and the states by underestimating the value of the oil and underpaying royalties to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars. The Department of Interior's Minerals Management Service drafted rules to end this underpayment fraud and assure that taxpayers get the money they deserve.

But the royalty giveaway amendment stops the Interior Department from implementing new rules that would require more accurate pricing of oil produced from public lands. Those rules, the product of long investigations, would base the value of the oil on actual market prices instead of on the much lower prices reported by the oil companies. Delaying this rule from going into effect will cost taxpayers \$66 million a year—\$5.5 million for each month that the rule is delayed. That means a loss of \$1.8 million a year for California alone.

Our state turns federal oil and gas royalties over to the public schools, and most other states share a portion of these revenues with their schools—money that could be used to buy computers or pay teachers' salaries or reduce class size. If the federal government had collected the royalties we were due, California could have paid the salaries of 45 teachers next year. Instead, thanks to this sneaky amendment, that money will line the oil industry's pockets.

Senator HUTCHISON, who sponsored this amendment, claims more time is needed to study the issue. We already spent years studying the issue. A task force has filed its report documenting hundreds of millions of dollars in underpayments.

The current system must be changed. The Justice Department recently decided to intervene in litigation accusing four major oil companies of knowingly having underpaid hundreds of millions of dollars in royalties from federal and Indian leases in the Gulf of Mexico, Wyoming, New Mexico and California. There is no justification for preventing the Interior Department from performing its legal mandate: to ensure that we get fair market value from the production from public lands.

The giveaway rider ignores substantial evidence of underpayments developed by the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee, thanks to the leadership of Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY, who joins us this morning. We call on the Congress to reverse this greedy and unwarranted action and pass the Miller-Boxer bill to restore the royalties that the taxpayers, and the schoolchildren, of this nation deserve.

**PART 2: JOBS WITH JUSTICE:
FIRST NATIONAL WORKERS'
RIGHTS BOARD HEARING**

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 7, 1998

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, Jobs With Justice convened its "First National Workers' Rights Board Hearing on Welfare/Workfare Issues" in Chicago in 1997. This hearing featured a number of community, labor and political leaders. I include their remarks for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Part 2 of this statement includes: Joselito Laudencia of Californians for Justice; Christopher Lamb of the Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law; Sabrina Gillon of the Campaign for a Sustainable Milwaukee; and Paul Booth of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME).

CALIFORNIANS FOR JUSTICE

(By Joselito Laudencia, Executive Director)

Good morning. My name is Joselito Laudencia and I am the Executive Director of Californians for Justice. Californians for Justice is a grassroots multiracial organization working to build political power among communities of color, and poor and young people of all colors in California. Earlier this year, we launched a campaign for Economic Justice. With welfare reform devastating our constituencies, we decided to launch a multi-year campaign for public jobs. Specifically, with the state government pushing hundreds of thousands of welfare recipients into the workforce, we feel that the state government has a responsibility to ensure that jobs are available, that these jobs are good paying jobs with benefits, and that these jobs actually address the needs of California's communities.

Let me provide some context. The signing into law of welfare reform on a federal level sent a simple message that everyone on welfare needs to get a job. The new law says that everyone on welfare must be at work within 24 months for a minimum of 20 hours a week. Currently, there are over 900,000 welfare recipients in California, with at least 300,000 facing this two-year time limit within two years. And families have only 5 years in a lifetime to receive welfare—even if there are no jobs.

This destruction of the welfare system comes at a time when jobs have been leaving over the last 25 years. Corporations have been downsizing, automating, shifting to part-time workers and moving overseas.

If any job growth is happening, it occurs in two fields. One area includes highly skilled jobs. As Times Magazine in January 1997 highlighted, the hottest fields in terms of new jobs include teachers, nurses, executives, lawyers, financial managers, computer engineers, and accountants, jobs which require extensive levels of education and training.

The other arena includes the fast growing occupations and industries that frequently offer part-time or temporary work and often lack basic benefits, especially in the retail trade and the service sector.

We also have to realize that the U.S. and the California economy have never provided enough jobs. Although the unemployment rate has been at its lowest in 23 years, over 1 million people in California are "officially" unemployed. On top of that, California will witness over 100,000 college graduates and over 270,000 public high school graduates. This also doesn't take into account the over

1 million underemployed, who include involuntary part-time workers and persons not working due to lack of child care, transportation and other factors. Plus, this doesn't include discouraged workers who've stopped working and workers who work full time at low-wages that aren't enough to survive.

With millions looking for work and welfare recipients entering the workforce, California projects a job growth of only 270,000 each year.

If we look at traditional efforts to create jobs, we find that they don't work. Providing tax subsidies to corporations to create jobs hasn't worked. Job training programs usually result in individuals completing programs with no jobs at the end process.

With this context, Californians for Justice is waging a public jobs campaign in California and is urging that Jobs with Justice take on a public job creation campaign as a necessary strategy to provide a viable and alternative solution to welfare reform.

We must reassert the role of government to ensure the health and well-being of every person, especially those most in need.

To conclude, I'd like to outline the political principles that guide our efforts to job creation: (1) Jobs must be at living wage salaries and with benefits, including health care and child care; (2) Jobs must be new jobs and not replace or displace pre-existing workers or positions; (3) These jobs must be union jobs; (4) Priority for jobs must be given to communities of color, women and poor communities that have been devastated by unemployment; (5) Public jobs must be in projects that will truly benefit communities. Projects must reflect a politics of redistribution of wealth to low-income communities and communities of color and not predominantly a funding of private industry with public funds in a way that maintains a structure of wealth moving upward for profit maximization; (6) A Jobs program must address the entire need for jobs towards eradicating unemployment; (7) Since this system cannot guarantee jobs for all and because there are people unable to work, there must be a safety net and aright to entitlement benefits, including childcare, medical care, transportation and living wage cash grants.

No one organization or group can make this happen. We all need to work together to expose the truth that the jobs are not out there and push for a pro-active solution that addresses the needs of all our communities.

CENTER ON SOCIAL WELFARE POLICY AND LAW (By Christopher Lamb)

I. INTRODUCTION

My name is Christopher Lamb. I am a senior attorney at The Welfare Law Center in New York City. We are a national not-for-profit law office dedicated to working with and on behalf of welfare recipients and organizations of welfare recipients in securing and protecting recipients' legal rights to fair and decent treatment both as welfare recipients and, where applicable, as workers in welfare work programs. We are currently counsel in several class action lawsuits involving abuses in New York City's workfare program. We are also coordinating a national effort to support workfare organizing called the Workfare Research and Advocacy Project.

II. WORKFARE BACKGROUND

Workfare is work performed as a condition of receiving a welfare grant. It is not a job. While it may be possible to gain recognition of workfare participants' status as workers to secure them coverage under the multitude of employment laws that most of us take for granted, doing so in most cases will require political and legal battles.

Workfare is not new. Various types of work relief have existed for as long as there has been public assistance and workfare existed as part of the federal AFDC program for its last thirty years. Workfare therefore has a track record and that record shows that it is not an effective path off of welfare or to higher income or to a job.

Despite the dismal history of workfare as a strategy for moving people off of welfare and into jobs, last year's federal welfare reform bill places substantial pressure to expand existing workfare programs and to create new ones. Over a quarter of the states currently have workfare programs and it is likely that more states will add programs as the pressures increase under the federal law to have welfare recipients in what the bill calls "work activities". New York City has the largest workfare program in the nation with close to 40,000 participants.

III. WORKFARE PROBLEMS

As cities and states expand their workfare programs, workfare participants are facing many problems that are common to other low-wage workers as well as some that are unique to their situations as workfare workers. In many instances, these problems are surfacing first and most prominently in New York City's program because of its size and because it has been operating at a very substantial size for longer than most other programs. There is, however, no reason to believe that any of these issues will appear only in New York.

Health and Safety. Workfare workers who were performing hot, dirty work cleaning streets in New York City had to sue this summer to gain access to bathrooms and drinking water, protective clothing, and right to know training about work place hazards. Although the workers won a court order, lack of appropriate protective gear and failure to provide right to know training remain commonplace at worksites throughout the City.

New York City is not alone in failing to maintain appropriate health and safety standards for its workfare workers. In Los Angeles, for example, workfare workers at city hospitals who are required to mop floors soiled with blood and other medical waste are not provided with boots or other protective clothing.

Workers' Compensation. In Ohio, the Ohio Supreme Court recently struck down a state law which limited to \$33/week the death benefit paid to the widow of a workfare worker killed by a work-related illness. Similar laws are still in effect in other states. For example, New York law guarantees workers' compensation to workfare workers, "but not necessarily at the same benefit level" provided to other workers.

Minimum and Prevailing Wage. New York City ignored a state law which required it to compensate workfare workers at prevailing wage and then when a court ordered it to comply with the law the City successfully sought to have the statute repealed. Elsewhere, serious minimum wage violations are occurring. In several states, workfare workers are being required to work 35 to 40 hours per week although they receive cash assistance and food stamps that are equal to closer to 20 hours per week at the minimum wage.

Denial of Access to Ed. and Training. In New York City, the growth of the workfare programs has had a devastating impact on welfare recipients' access to education and training. At the City University of New York, the number of welfare recipients enrolled dropped from 27,000 to 22,000 in one year and is still dropping. Small pre-college and vocational educational programs have seen even more devastating drops in enrollment.

IV. IMPACT ON OTHER WORKERS

Large scale workfare programs inevitably result in the displacement of other workers and the loss of jobs paying decent wages. Simultaneously with increasing its workfare program to about 40,000 participants, New York City reduced its payroll by over 20,000 workers. Displacement has also been documented elsewhere. In Baltimore, for example, the school board has replaced custodial workers who were paid a living wage under a local living wage ordinance with workfare workers.

The use of workfare workers also depresses the wages of other workers. In New York, for example, it has been estimated that 30,000 workfare workers working 26 hours per week would result in the depression of wages in the bottom third of the workforce by 9% or in the displacement of 20,000 other workers, or some combination of these two effects.

V. CONCLUSION

The vast majority of welfare recipients with whom I speak in my work want to work. They want to earn a wage with which they can meet their families' basic needs and they want to be treated fairly and decently in the workplace. In other words, they want jobs, not workfare. It is incumbent upon all of us to fight with them toward that goal.

HOW AFDC/W-2 HAS AFFECTED ME

(By Sabrina Gillon)

Hello, my name is Sabrina Gillon and this is my statement of how AFDC/W-2 has affected my life and forced me to leave out of college at Milwaukee Area Technical College.

I first entered college in the Fall of 1995. I originally entered into college at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and half way through the semester I was told that in order to receive any daycare for my son I would have to leave UWM and go to a two year college. At the end of the Fall semester, I left UWM, reluctantly, and went to Milwaukee Area Technical College. Once there, I enrolled in the Administrative Assistant Program which was a very far stretch away from the Wildlife Conservationist program that I was in at UWM.

The entire time I was in classes at MATC, I was constantly being sent letters saying that I was being sanctioned for no reason at all because I was attending all of my classes on a daily basis and working in the computer lab when I wasn't in class. All together I was down at the MATC campus a total of 7 to 8 hours a day. At one point in time, I was being sent sanction letters every other week for about 2 to 3 months. It was a very maddening and frustrating time for me. I would have to miss class in order to go down to the welfare office and get the matter straightened out. My worker, Alexia Daniels, was usually not able to be reached and I would have to request to see her supervisor just to get the situation cleared up.

As spring semester of 1997 came I was continually reminded that my time to be in school was coming to a close and that I should begin looking for a job. When I asked my worker, Jane Jilk, at the Milwaukee Job Center Network (North) about possible ways in which I could stay in school, all she could say was for me to take some evening classes and she emphasized that *daycare would not be provided*. Any my question to her was "how am I going to be able to take night classes when I have no one to watch my 3 year old son while I am in class?" She could not even give me a reasonable answer. This is part of the area of W-2 and/or AFDC that confuses me though. How is it that some participants on AFDC are able to continue their college schooling and also continue to receive

daycare for their child(ren), while others are told that they are on their own, or "Gee, that's just to bad." For this system to supposedly be designed to help people, I truly do not see where it shows any caring or compassion for the individuals who are on it, especially those who are trying to achieve a goal greater than one of simply working for minimum wage. Is it so wrong to want for a better life in which we, AFDC recipients, can make reasonable wages so that we can sustain and take care of our families?

In closing, I would just like to say that W-2, as it is now, is just not going to work. Many people are going to be destitute and lost. The United States is one of the richest countries in the world, yet one of the poorest when it comes to caring about its own people. I can only hope that the Government and Thompson soon see that W-2 is not as wonderful and spectacular as they presume it to be. Thank you very much for your thoughtfulness, time, and consideration in listening to what I had to say. It is greatly appreciated.

TESTIMONY OCTOBER 25, 1997 TO NATIONAL
WORKERS RIGHTS BOARD

(By Paul Booth, Assistant to the President
and Director of Field Services)

If there was a time when the labor movement held itself apart from the trials and tribulations of people on relief, that day is gone.

The AFL-CIO proclaimed our commitment to organizing workfare workers at the February Council meeting, proclaimed the solidarity of the unionized 13 million American workers with the million recipients who are being placed into the workplace. The connections we are creating—in Baltimore, between AFSCME council 67 and local 44, and BUILD, the community organization, and Solidarity Sponsoring Committee, and the welfare recipients who are joining this coalition as members in good standing; in New York, between AFSCME District Council 37, and ACORN, and JWW, which has now unmistakably demonstrated the demand for representation—these connections exemplify the

AFL-CIO's policy, and they defeat the insidious intent of the Gingrich crowd, namely to pit union workers against workfare workers in a Hobbesian conflict that could only destroy our hard-won conditions of work, to the detriment of all.

AFSCME, the Service Employees, and the Communications Workers, took the initiative, as soon as the new law was enacted, to try to redefine the issue. That it be seen not just as the change from welfare dependency, to work; it is about the conditions of that work.

We ask you to make the finding that these questions are within your purview, as matters of Workers Rights . . . that recipients, once placed on the job, are workers, entitled to these rights: To a living wage job; to membership in the union at their workplace; to organize in a union where one is not in place; and to equal treatment under the labor laws.